



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,361	02/05/2001	Tatsuo Yokota	9333/259	4262

7590 10/07/2004

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P. O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/777,361

Applicant(s)

YOKOTA, TATSUO

Examiner

Steven P Sax

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The RCE and amendment filed 6/24/04 have been entered. Per applicant request, claim 4 has been cancelled.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunimatsu et al (6653948) and Mutoh et al (6606465).

4. Regarding claim 1, Kunimatsu et al disclose a method for a vehicle navigation apparatus in which menu items are displayed on a screen and when a predetermined menu item is selected, a corresponding function is executed (Figure 5, column 2 lines 10-30). The method determines whether a function corresponding to a menu item displayed on the screen can be executed and if it determines that it cannot be executed, disables the menu item from being selected (Figure 6, column 2 lines 45-62, column 7 line 55 – column 8 line 5) and displays a reason why the menu items cannot be selected (column 8 lines 1-25).

Art Unit: 2174

Kunimatsu et al do not specifically go into the details of showing that when a predetermined amount of data which can be registered in a memory is in fact registered, a message is displayed indicating that the menu item cannot be displayed due to memory limitations. However, Kunimatsu do in fact though show indicating that a menu item cannot be selected due to the system being in a different mode, and such a mode determines which data is currently being registered in a memory (column 3 lines 4-12, column 9 lines 50-67, column 10 lines 14-30). Furthermore, Mutoh et al do disclose that when a predetermined amount of data which can be registered in a memory is in fact registered, a message is displayed indicating that the menu item cannot be displayed due to memory limitations (Mutoh et al column 7 lines 30-50, column 10 lines 25-51, column 11 lines 45-55). Mutoh et al do this to show that a menu item cannot be selected due to the system being in a different mode (such as FAX or copy, etc.), which thus determines which data is currently registered in the memory (again Mutoh et al column 10 lines 25-51, column 11 lines 45-55). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to display in Kunimatsu et al a message indicating that a menu item cannot be displayed due to memory limitations when a predetermined amount of data which can be registered in a memory is in fact registered, because it would provide a convenient way to indicate that a menu item cannot be selected due to a system being in another mode.

5. Regarding claim 2, Kunimatsu et al do not specifically state that the message is displayed in the field of the menu item, but do show the disablement in the field of the

Art Unit: 2174

menu item to clearly identify the nonselectable item (Figure 4E). Furthermore, Mutoh et al show a message indicating reason for why the menu item cannot be selected, in the field of the menu item (column 10 lines 30-40) to clearly identify the nonselectable item. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Kunimatsu et al, because it would provide a convenient way to clearly identify a nonselectable item.

6. Regarding claim 3, the disabled item is displayed so as to be distinguished from the non-disabled items (Kunimatsu et al Figure 4E).

7. Regarding claim 5, when the vehicle is in traveling mode, items relating to certain stopped mode functions are disabled, and no data for them is in the memory (Kunimatsu et al column 7 lines 55-65). Displaying a message indicating that the menu item cannot be selected due to this, in the field of the menu item, is shown in Mutoh et al. The motivation to combine this into the method of Kunimatsu et al is the same as that described in paragraph 5 of this Office Action.

---

8. Claims 9 and 10 recite the same features as recited in claim 5 and are rejected for the same reasons.

9. Claim 11 recites the same features as in claims 5 and 3, and is rejected for the reasons combined for which both those claims are rejected.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 6 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Claims 7-8 are allowable over the prior art of record.

12. Claims 6, 7-8, and 12, all bring out that the particular function is route guiding, and that a menu item corresponds to a function that can only be executed while the vehicle navigation system is performing route guiding, such that when route guiding is not in progress, the message indicating that the menu item cannot be displayed due to the fact that route guiding is not in progress, is displayed. Although Kinumatsu et al discuss the travel mode, these specific features of displaying a particular message relating to route guiding, in the context of the claims, is not set forth in the prior art of record.

---

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, regarding the memory limitation feature in which the Mutoh et al reference is used, note that Mutoh et al do in

Art Unit: 2174


fact show that the memory is currently being used for another mode and thus do indicate inability to perform a function due to memory limitations.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P Sax whose telephone number is 703-305-9582. Beginning October 20, the new telephone number will be **571-272-4072**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. Beginning October 20, the new telephone number will be **571-272-4063**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*

  
STEVEN SAX  
Patent Examiner